India

FOR THE

No. 177. New Series.
No. 271. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, MAY 24, 1901.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d | By Post, 2½d

Notes and News 241
Mr. Naoroji and the India Office ... 244
Our London Letter 245
Notes from Bombay 246
The Indian Famine Union: Interview with Sir W. Wedderburn ... 246
The Famine in India: 418,000 persons on Relief 247
Opinions of the British Press ... 247
British Indians in South Africa ... 248
Correspondence between Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji and Lord G. Hamilton 249
Indian Affairs in Parliament 250
Lord G. Hamilton on India 251
Advertisements 252

NOTES AND NEWS.

Mr. Schwann asked the Secretary of State for India (May 16) "to explain why telegrams from the Viceroy regarding the progress of famine in India had not for some weeks past been communicated to the British Press," and to state the present condition of things. Lord George Hamilton replied that "the communication of the official famine telegrams to the Press was discontinued about three months ago, when the number of persons on relief had become comparatively very small," adding that "as it is now increasing the publication will be resumed." Now, the last telegram at the time of the question was dated February 18, and it showed that the numbers on relief were 211,000, of whom 171,000 were in the Bombay Presidency. Four days earlier, however, the Viceroy had sent this message:—

> The number on relief works and receiving gratuitous relief shows little increase, but greater pressure is expected in the affected area after the reaping of the scanty harvests there.

Here was a distinct note of warning, and yet in face of it the official information was stopped. Would it have been revived if public attention had not been drawn to the subject?

What was in Lord George Hamilton's mind when he answered Mr. Schwann that the publication would be resumed "as it (the number of persons on relief) is now increasing"? Why "now"? The number has surely been increasing steadily since February 18. On February 23 the "Times of India" recorded an increase of 8,000 in Bombay, and also a slight increase in Baroda, and referred expressly to the Viceroy's telegram forecasting "that a somewhat serious distress would probably occur in the Bombay districts." On March 2 there were recorded further increases in Bombay, and an influx of destitute people into Madras. On March 9 the total remained much the same, with a decrease in Bombay, but a rise in Baroda. On March 16 the Bombay figures had risen to 220,000—nearly 50,000 higher than on February 18; and the Government of India showed its solicitude by authorising the Bombay Government to pass free of customs duty articles imported into India for free distribution to famine-stricken people up to the end of September. On March 23 there was still a total of 216,000, with a rise in Bombay, though decreases had taken place elsewhere. March 30 brought another increase. On April 6, it was recorded that five officers of the Indian Civil Service from Madras and Bengal, one from the Bengal police force, and one from the Burma police, had been placed by the Indian Government at the disposal of the Bombay Government for famine duty, while six additional Europeans had been temporarily engaged for duty as famine relief officers in Gujerat. Evidently it is not merely "now" that the number on relief is increasing; the increase has been practically continuous. Lord George Hamilton informed Mr. Schwann that the total was then 381,000, of whom 312,000 were in Bombay. Now (May 20) the total is reported at 418,000, of whom 344,000 are in Bombay—almost exactly a duplication of the figures of February 18.

The "Times" Simla correspondent (May 20) telegraphs that the Famine Commission Report is already in the hands of the Government of India, but that "its immediate publication is unlikely." Why is its immediate publication unlikely? Because, says the correspondent, "it will form the subject of a Government resolution also to be forwarded to the Secretary of State." A very remarkable reason surely. The public are anxious to know the results of the enquiry, and they certainly ought to know them at once. Immediate publication can in no way delay or prevent a Government resolution on the subject; nor does there appear to be any overpowering necessity that both Report and Resolution should reach the Secretary of State in the very same envelope. We hope that Lord George Hamilton will be afforded an opportunity of showing that he disapproves of this incomprehensible postponement of an important public document.

A Durban correspondent sends us a melancholy account of the present position of British-Indian subjects in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. He still maintains that no "permits" to return have been given to Indian refugees, and the statement appears to be borne out by the telegram from Sir Alfred Milner which Mr. Chamberlain read in the House of Commons on May 14. "All civil permits to men," Sir A. Milner said, "are issued on the condition that recipients join Rand Rifles. This does not seem advisable in case of Indians." But why does it not seem advisable? Mr. Chamberlain, we think, should be invited to explain. What is even worse is the treatment meted out to such Indians as happen to be in the Transvaal. They find not only that the old regulations of which they complained, and against which Mr. Chamberlain protested, remain in force, but that they are administered with a new severity. We are surely entitled to assume that this astonishing condition of affairs is only temporary, and that Mr. Chamberlain, being made aware of the facts, will hasten to remove the disabilities of which he complained under Mr. Kruger's "regime."

We referred in our issue of April 26 to the Indian address presented to Lord Harris on his departure from Natal. The "Natal Mercury" (weekly edition) of the same date prints the text of the address, which concluded with the words: "We wish your lordship a pleasant voyage, and a long life of usefulness to our gracious sovereign, and venture to hope that your lordship will always keep in your heart a corner for the Indian settlers in this garden colony." Lord Harris, in his reply, referred to the services of the Indian Ambulance Corps in the war, regretted that the Government could not accept the help of the troops offered by the Indian Princes, and expressed satisfaction that in many other ways Indians "rendered invaluable help to the Empire." He congratulated his hearers "on having made this garden colony their home," but, unless the report before us is incomplete, had not a word to say about the grievances of British Indians in South Africa. The best speech on the occasion seems to have been made by the Mayor of Durban, Mr. J. Nicol:—

> He hoped that Lord Harris would carry with him pleasant recollections of the Colony. He freely acknowledged that but for the timely help received from India the whole of the Colony might have been overrun by the enemy. He knew no community more loyal or law-abiding than the Indian, and he could never forget the great Indian gathering he witnessed before the Queen's statue on the mourning day.

Are the interests of this loyal and law-abiding community to be ignored in the "settlement" in South Africa?

Natal continues to give proofs of how much it values its position as a part of the British Empire, and how cordial are the sympathies of its people with their fellow subjects. The "Times of India" believes that it will be impossible to exclude Indians from that colony, but

it quotes with reprobation the remarks of the "Natal Witness" on the employment of Indian labourers. The serious aspect of this, the "Witness" declares, is not that Indians are employed as coolies, so much as that they obtain more remunerative work. There is not so much objection to them as manual labourers, if only they would not develop into "store-keepers, merchants, and clerks." They are even engaged on the Natal Government Railway in clerical work of various kinds, "for which white men should be employed."

We deeply regret the premature death of Sir Arthur Strachey, Chief Justice of the North-Western Provinces. He was an able and pleasant man, and a keen worker, and he would in time, we do not doubt, have justified his position. But one cannot but resent the ignorant partiality of a friendly political paper, the "Pioneer," which is not ashamed to speak of him as "a subtle jurist, a profound lawyer, and possessed of all the qualities of a great judge." It is nearer the truth to say that his "advancement was almost unexampled in the annals of India." His political connexion, however, had vastly more to do with that than his personal qualifications, though these were quite as good as most British Indian judges and Chief Justices possess to start with. It is painful to make such a remonstrance on an occasion that one would wish to limit to the expression of regret and sympathy.

The reckless stuff that some of our journals are capable of submitting to an intelligent public is conspicuously exemplified in the "Pall Mall Gazette" of May 15. Of course our contemporary attributes Sir Arthur Strachey's appointment at Bombay to "his remarkable powers." It then says:—

Sir Arthur Strachey displayed unexampled firmness in dealing with that seditious conspiracy in which the notorious Tilak brothers were the most dangerous characters. Their inflammatory writing produced, it will be remembered, a rising in Bombay which required several days to suppress it.

This reminds us of the genesis of Falstaff's men in buckram. It is the first time we have heard of the "Tilak brothers," which seems strange if they ever existed, and were in fact "notorious" and "dangerous characters." If our contemporary will but look up the report of the trial of Mr. Tilak—there is only one Mr. Tilak—it will find that the notion of a "seditious conspiracy" is all moonshine. Why, the prosecuting counsel not only did not charge conspiracy but expressly repudiated it. And how can anybody remember "a rising in Bombay" in consequence of the alleged "inflammatory writing," when in fact no such thing ever took place? This astounding series of blunders was adopted next day in the "Morning Post," which we had begun to think capable of better things. The example of the "Globe," one might have anticipated, would have warned other journals of the risk of making reckless imputations of this sort upon Mr. Tilak.

The Simla correspondent of the "Times" (May 16) cites two recent official reports to disprove the allegation, which seems to have been made in some quarters—"frequently" made, he says—that the Native States managed their famine better than the British Government managed theirs. The two reports deal with Patiala and Indore, among others. The Supreme Government, it appears, directed the attention of the Patiala Durbar to the necessity for action in October 1899. But it received no report till the following March, and then the report was two months old, and showed inadequate energy, and it was not till May that the Durbar was galvanised into "vigorous action." But, if so, why did not the Government keep its finger more firmly upon Patiala? Why allow all these months to run on so helplessly? If it was entitled to put on the screw in May, why did it not make its authority felt in November? Whatever blame may rest on Patiala, the report seems to inculpate the Supreme or the Local Government, or both, as well. Holkar, again, we are told, "persistently declined to grant funds for relief measures, though the people were dying of starvation." Indeed, "a point was reached where force had nearly to be used to obtain money from the Indore treasury," which is said to have held "a surplus of several crores in hard cash." One would like to hear Holkar's side of the question now. By all means let the breeze of public opinion play freely on the Native States, but do not let us base judgment on one view or on one part of alleged facts, but on the whole of the actual facts—if these could only be got at.

The account given by the "Madras Mail" of the Report on the Administration of Cochin just issued by the Dewan, contains several matters which will repay consideration. It is Mr. P. Rajagopala Chariyar's last Report, as he will have ceased to be Dewan before the next one is due. Since he assumed office in 1896 he has initiated a series of important reforms. The most important of all was the revision of the State Accounts, which had fallen into the utmost confusion. During the whole of his administration he had the "intelligent help and very firm support" of the Raja, not to speak of the British Residents, with whom he seems to have worked most amicably. He also secured the services of Mr. S. Swaminatha Iyer, a Deputy Collector from Madras. But the main credit of the reforms rests with the Dewan alone. The "Madras Mail" regrets that he cannot be persuaded to continue in office a few years longer.

Two special points in the Report deserve notice. First, the liberal administration of the Forests. Under his administration, indeed, organised thefts of timber have been steadily repressed; but the people are allowed to remove freely timber for agricultural implements, leaves for manure, and thorns for fencing, while cattle, goats, and sheep may graze without charge. How is it that Cochin can afford to follow this generous policy in the management of its forests? Secondly, the money for the new railway is to be found in Cochin itself. Not only is there every probability that the line will pay well, but there is this additional advantage. As the "Madras Mail" says: "The capital is a rupee capital, too, supplied wholly by the Cochin State," to which the whole benefit will accrue save only the working charges payable to the Madras Railway Company. "There will be no 'promotion' money, no expensive Board of Directors and office establishment in London, and no charges for converting profits into gold and remitting them to England."

But Cochin will not only save this direct loss. It will at the same time avoid adding its share to the drain of wealth from India, and to the economic effects of that drain. Having to lay down money in England means the necessity of forcing a market for Indian products to that amount, and consequently the raising of prices against India, that country having to sell its goods at a cheaper rate and buy at a dearer than it would otherwise have done. There remains the question, how Cochin has been able to avoid the common lot of having to construct its railways with capital borrowed from Europe. Strange as it may seem, Cochin has no national debt; indeed, like the sister State of Travancore, there is a large balance to its credit, which at the beginning of the year amounted to two years' revenue. Hence it is able to finance its own railway.

During the recent famine free grazing in the forests of the Punjab was permitted, and did much to keep the cattle alive. The loss of income was under half a lakh, though this leaves out of account the loss incurred by the lopping of young trees for fodder. One unexpected point in the year's report is the "remarkable immunity from serious outbreaks of forest fires," though, the time being one of drought, such fires, it was thought, would be more numerous than usual. The Conservator gave as the reason that, as the raising of a new crop of grass was chimerical, the people were less ready than usual to make way for it by setting fire to the remnants of the old. But the "Friend of India" is of opinion that much must be attributed to the care of the herdsmen in protecting the grass from accidental ignition, there being great numbers of people encamped on the area usually reserved.

Three fresh events are recorded in connexion with the Noakhali case. First, the High Court has set aside the rule against Mr. Reily, the Suspended District Superintendent of Police. He will now act in that capacity at Nadia. Secondly, Mr. Pennell has, through

the Government of Bengal, submitted a new memorial to the Secretary of State, praying that he may be reinstated and compensated. The passages to which objection was taken in his first memorial, and in consequence of which the local government refused its transmission, do not now appear. Thirdly, Mr. N. Bonham Carter, magistrate of Mymensingh, has been selected to conduct an enquiry into the police administration of the district of Noakhali. He will be assisted by Madhu Sudan Chowdry Bahadur, District Superintendent of Police in the Nadia district. It will be observed that Mr. Reily has been posted to Nadia in the teeth of the reflections on him contained in the judgment of Mr. Geidt.

Sir Henry Fowler on Monday evening, in the course of his speech on the amendment which has so greatly increased his unpopularity in the Liberal party, urged that the United Kingdom spent too much on the Army, especially as her frontiers were not land, but sea. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his reply said:—

> The right hon. gentleman thinks you can save on the Army. He considers that our military expenditure is excessive, and he supported that proposition by the astounding assertion that we have no land frontier to defend. Why, Sir, he is a little Englander indeed! And yet he was Secretary for India. Has he not spent any money in defending India? Why, do not we keep up a very large part of our Army for the simple purpose of defending India? India pays only that portion of the British Army which may happen to be there at the time; but if India were attacked on its land frontier, as India may be attacked some day, as nobody knows better than the right hon. gentleman, surely it would be necessary for us to be prepared to defend her with a much larger army than that which happens to be in India.

Sir Michael's remarks suggest many questions. Let us ask two. Can he tell us where the Indian frontier is? And when was a shilling of British money spent "in defending India"?

Mr. N. N. Ghose, in his presidential address at the Bengal Provincial Conference held at Midnapore last month, complained of "the spirit of the times"—"the reactionary wave" that has been rising since the appearance of the plague in the latter part of 1896. First, he dealt with the question of the separation of judicial and executive functions, which has been emphatically brought home to everybody by recent events in Bengal. Mr. Ghose will not be content with any of the proposed ideas, which he regards as "poor, half-hearted, mechanical manipulations of the existing arrangements." He wants "a body of principles." He says:—

> It is not enough that the judge shall not be an executive officer; it is necessary that he shall not be subject to the executive . . . . Judicial officers, again, should have had legal training, should have attained a certain maturity, should have moved for some time in the atmosphere of the courts. . . . . If then the judge is to have something more than an academic training, and if he is to be independent of the executive, he cannot be a civilian. . . . . Lastly, it is necessary that the judicial officer should not be subject in any special way to the social influences of the executive. . . . . Possibly the greatest difficulty in the way of a just administration in this country is the kind of social feeling which prevails in the Anglo-Indian community.

The essential condition of reform, then, is "that the judiciary and the executive should be distinct services, and that judiciary should be recruited entirely from the legal profession and be subject to the control of the High Court."

But the separation of the judicial and executive services, though "a necessary," is "not an ultimate reform." The real end to be achieved is "the abolition, or (if you choose to call it so) the reconstitution of the civil service," which has become "somewhat of an anachronism to-day." Mr. Ghose argues:—

> It had its origin at a time when the Natives of the country had not been sufficiently educated in the language, the laws, and the institutions of England, when government meant little more than keeping order and collecting revenue. . . . . There was no multiplicity of functions combined as in the magistrate of to-day, nor was there any elaborate system of laws to be administered with technical precision, nor any class of qualified Natives ready to take into their hands the task of administration. The country has outgrown those conditions and the Civilian is now in truth an anomaly. . . . . The precise mode of reconstitution is a matter of detail. But the principle I desire to assert is that the real end to be striven for is not so much the regulation of the examinations in England with reference to marks and subjects, or the holding of simultaneous examinations in England and India, or the splitting of functions, or the reduction of salaries and pensions, as the entire reorganisation of the services which have to do the higher judicial, ministerial, executive, and revenue work of the country.

And in connexion with this matter Mr. Ghose reviews the history of the Uncovenanted Service, and points out "how the claims of the children of the soil to offices in that service have failed to receive adequate recognition."

"Possibly," says Mr. Ghose, "the gravest injustice of all is that which has been done to our countrymen who are in the Educational Service or desire to enter it. . . . . The fact is, High Education itself seems to be viewed with jealousy, and that is one of the most prominent signs of the prevailing retrograde policy." Lord Curzon himself has recently admitted, however, that the educational policy cannot be reversed. Mr. Ghose reviews the field. He handles the Universities pretty firmly, and declares that "superior teachers are the one thing needful"—all else would follow. As for Vernacular Education, he criticises severely the report of the Committee appointed some time ago by the Government of Bengal to consider the Bengal system, and the action of the Government up on that report. He sets out particulars, and then says it is difficult to see "of what use this loose, fragmentary, miscellaneous, so-called scientific knowledge will be for purposes of education or business." And what has been done for industrial and technical students? Mr. Ghose says:—

> What has been the fate of those who have taken to botany, forestry, or agricultural chemistry? Those who have gone into service are prospering, the rest are starving and struggling. Government did not know what to do with its agricultural scholars brought up at Cirencester, and either left them out in the cold or appointed them as deputy magistrates.

And "not only in academic education, but in the great educational agency of institutions, the policy of the Government has been retrograde." The standing example, of course, is the blow dealt to local self-government in Calcutta. Mr. Ghose also refers to the penal laws in curtailment of liberty of speech. "There has been retrogression all along the line."

Mr. I. G. Selby essays a task that is sufficiently praiseworthy though it seems to border on the hopeless. He holds up the mirror to us, and tells us what a Chinaman sees in it. In a brief and pointed series of admirable dialogues between representative personages—"As the Chinese see us" (London: Fisher Unwin)—he conveys the conflicting views of the existing situation in China, with the main emphasis on the Chinese view. That view is much more intelligible than creditable to our vanity. Why should the Chinese take to us when we too often exhibit to them "coarse manners," when we "are too indifferent to learn their speech and respect their customs," when we are in their country "in virtue of treaties which were either wrested by war or have been conceded from fear of renewed war?" Is ignorant contempt so very unfitting an answer to ignorant contempt? Is there, or is there not, "the same equal brotherhood among men of all classes in the outside countries as in the Middle Kingdom"? How can we talk of ethical superiority with opium (and the deplorable history of opium) in our right hand, and in view of the open "fact that most of these men from the Outside States live loosely"? Except for the one class who interweave politics with religion, the Chinese make no difficulty with missionaries: "What we distrust and dislike is the men who profess your religion"; "our chief allegation against Him is that He is claimed as the patron-god of your many political delinquencies." They detest "the new Imperialism."

Remittances on India for 60 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs. 2,36,55,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3⅞d. to 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds. The following amounts in bills were allotted—viz., Rs. 26,61,000 on Calcutta, Rs. 21,00,000 on Bombay, and Rs. 12,39,000 on Madras, all at an average of 1s. 3.906d. Tenders at 1s. 3d. and 29-32nds will receive about 26 per cent. Later the Council sold bills for Rs. 45,000 on Bombay and Rs. 10,000 on Madras at 1s. 3d. and 15-16ths, and telegraphic transfers for two lakhs on Bombay at 1s. 4d. Last week remittances for Rs. 60,30,059 were disposed of for £400,092, making the total sold from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs. 3,78,46,792, producing £2,512,254. Next week 60 lakhs will again be offered.

MR. NAOROJI AND THE INDIA OFFICE.

THE miserable state of India, her economic difficulties and the disappointment of the hopes fostered by intercourse with the West, and by the promises of the Government, led that veteran patriot, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, to address a letter to Lord George Hamilton. His lordship replied, and some other letters (reproduced in our columns) passed, which may at least have the good effect of bringing into relief the exact differences between the controversialists. The central point in the discussion related to the promises of equality in the appointment to offices, and the extent to which those promises had been fulfilled. But incidentally some kindred subjects, the economic drain, the almost total exclusion of Indians from Cooper's Hill, and the law of sedition were mentioned. Nor was the general tone of the discussion other than friendly. It was, indeed, unfortunate that the Secretary of State should have gone out of his way to resent what he was pleased to consider the attacks of Mr. Naoroji on British officials. Mr. Naoroji is too well known for his moderation and his steadfast loyalty to the English connexion to need any defence. It is sufficient to point out that to declare a system of government too costly, and to indicate in what ways it may be improved, is neither to vilify its agents nor to compass its overthrow. But at the same time it is pleasant to find some passages in Lord George Hamilton's letters which show that he is at one with Mr. Naoroji, if not in action, at least in sympathy. He says: "I am most sincerely anxious to do everything I can to benefit India, and I cordially welcome co-operation from any quarter." Nor could he better sum up the aim of Mr. Naoroji and his political associates than "cordial and sympathetic relations between European and Native, between governors and governed." Yet this is his own professed desire.

As we have said, the discussion turns mainly on the admission of Indians to a share in the Government. But other questions necessarily arise. The great subject of the economic drain on India and the consequent impoverishment of the country is dismissed by Lord George Hamilton with a direct negative. The country, he says, is getting richer, not poorer. He does not produce his evidence, and therefore it becomes a case of unsupported assertion on his part. As for famine we are again assured that that is a consequence of the failure of the rains. But elsewhere Lord George Hamilton joins issue on two questions of fact, the first relating to the Indian laws against sedition and the second to the admission of Indians to Cooper's Hill. It may perhaps be worth while to dispose of these two points before dealing with the main subject of the argument.

Lord George Hamilton asserts that the law of sedition is the same in India as in England. Now, if this be the truth, it is one of those truths that conceal a dangerous error. The words of the Act may be the same in each case, but the freedom of the Press in England does not rest on the letter of the law. Its true protection is in the system of trial by jury and the influence of public opinion, and neither of these safeguards is to be found in India. And first, as to trial by jury. That no doubt exists in India, but how different is the institution there. In the prosecution of Mr. Tilak the jury consisted of nine persons, six Europeans and three Indians. The Europeans were all ignorant of the Marathi tongue, and the whole case turned on the meaning of certain writings in that language. How then can the law be said to be the same when the method of trial was so different? As for the second great guarantee of liberty in England, it is in India even more conspicuously absent. No doubt the rulers are not entirely deaf to the opinion of the people of the country, but they are seldom in a position thoroughly to understand it, and it weighs with them lightly in comparison with that of their own people, whether at home or in India. The law of sedition may be the same in England and in India, but in the one country the accused is prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced by his own countrymen, in the other for the most part by aliens. Nor is this all. In what sense can it be said that the law in the two countries is the same when it has been laid down by a Judge in India that disaffection is want of affection? Has such a dictum ever been acknowledged in England? Nay, further, an editor in India can be brought up before a court and ordered to find sureties for good behaviour, without having even the option of going before a jury. Under these circumstances how is it pertinent to repeat that the definition of sedition is the same in the two Acts? Nor is it much of a compliment to England to say that the Indian law of sedition is milder than that of any of the great Governments of Europe. Are we to take our standard of liberty from Germany or Russia?

As regards the second question of fact, the admission of Indians to Cooper's Hill, Lord George Hamilton repeats that in fixing the number of admissions for which Indians might compete he did not in any way restrict the entry of Indian students. Now this is a plain contradiction in terms. Formerly, Indians could compete for all the vacancies. They were eligible according to their merits. Now whatever the merits of the candidates only two can enter in one year. It is beside the question to say that the average for some years had only been one. The number of candidates had been increasing, and it was, therefore, probable, or at least possible, that the number of successes would increase also. But in any case the fixing of a limit that could never be exceeded was certainly the placing of a restriction on Indian candidates, irrespective of whether the limit number was one that would in fact under free competition be ever exceeded. Before admission was open to merit—now it is circumscribed by considerations of race.

Here we touch the main controversy. Mr. Naoroji contends that it is the duty of the Government to carry out its repeated promises, and to fulfil the words of the Queen's proclamation when she assumed the direct government of India. He does not claim that a certain proportion of the officers of government should be his countrymen. He does not request that Indians should be in any way favoured. He takes his stand on the Queen's proclamation, and demands that its words should be faithfully and honestly interpreted. He only asks that in accordance with those words every post should be open to the Indian in so far as he may be worthy of it. Nor does this reading of the proclamation seem in itself to provoke the dissent of Lord George Hamilton, for he says that men should be qualified for office by "character, ability, and knowledge," and should not be disqualified by "religion or race." But he makes an addition which profoundly alters the whole meaning of the great proclamation, or in other words he reads something into the proclamation which is not there. And he also, as in the case of Cooper's Hill, completely mistakes the principle for which the Indians contend.

To take the latter point first, he dwells on the increase in the number of Indians holding appointments under British rule, as if that was the point at issue. The Indians have never claimed a fixed number of appointments, or a maximum number, or a minimum. What they demand is a fair field and no favour. Let their admission be on the same terms as that of all other aspirants. Let their promotion follow in accordance with their merit. Let it be asked in each case, not what is this official's race, but what are his qualifications for the work, and what is his record. Just as at Cooper's Hill Lord George Hamilton thought he must satisfy all claims if he gave two admissions when on an average only one had been gained before, so in the larger field of public appointments in India he thinks it enough to say that more Indians are now employed than formerly. But the Queen's proclamation laid down quite another principle—the free admission of Indians to every office in India on the same terms as their European fellow-subjects, and it is that principle which the Indians wish to see enforced.

But though, as we have seen, Lord George Hamilton admits the words on which this reasoning is based, he adds a qualification of his own. The admission of Indians is "subject to the one condition which must necessarily prevail so long as India is under the direct government of the Crown, that a certain proportion of the higher administrative posts must be filled by Europeans." This is not in the proclamation, nay, it is directly against both the spirit and the letter of that, and many other promises of equal treatment. What is this "certain proportion" and where does it come from? The language is perniciously vague. Nor does Lord George Hamilton tell us

why this condition "must necessarily prevail." Cannot the direct government of the Crown be carried on by the King's Indian subjects, or by a combination of Indians and Europeans in any proportions? Surely, the proper proportion of Europeans to Indians in the higher administrative posts must depend on the number of qualified and suitable Indians, and this cannot be determined by abstract calculation, but may be best discovered by leaving an open field and no favour. Or does Lord George Hamilton consider that the preservation of some artificial proportion is necessary to the maintenance of British rule? Does he suppose that the Indians will be more loyal when they find a certain proportion of posts reserved for Europeans, than if they saw themselves barred by no such privileges? Or can he think of anything more certain to strengthen the loyalty of educated India than the knowledge that Indians could freely rise to the highest posts in the administration of their country?

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

Parliament completes this week the second of the three stages which make up the life of a Session. A retrospect of its achievements since Easter might be summed up in the phrase of one syllable that was issued the other day as a Parliamentary return. There was a preamble to that return, just as in the King's Speech there was a preamble to the Session, but the gist of the matter found expression in the single word "Nil." The locution might have been coined for an epitaph. Is it to be the epitaph of the Session? So far, nothing has been accomplished in the way of legislation. All the energies of Parliament have been devoted to the raising of money and the voting of supplies. It is said that the Duke of Devonshire has set his heart on getting the Education Bill through before the prorogation. His desire can only be gratified by an unusual extension of the Session. A Drunkards' Bill, introduced by the Bishop of Winchester, has also been taken up by the Government, but, as Lord Salisbury himself has virtually admitted, with no more serious purpose than to smother the temperance agitation.

Men have made more advancement than measures. Mr. Churchill, for instance, has already won a considerable reputation. He had the advantage to begin with of possessing what he himself has characteristically described as "a splendid name," but his severest critics acknowledge that the young man has great inherent abilities. Mr. Churchill, however, is suffering from a surfeit of flattery. Like Dr. Johnson, he must sometimes be tempted to ask indiscreet admirers to consider what their praise is worth before they choke him with it. Another young politician who now stands in the front rank, but who has had to fight his way to that position through a veritable tempest of obloquy and abuse, is Mr. Lloyd George. The official seal was set to Mr. George's services at the meetings, last week, of the National Liberal Federation. A year ago he would hardly have been heard even in that company. In other words, he was a year in advance of his time.

From Easter down to Whitsuntide Lord Salisbury has scarcely been seen in Parliament at all. He returned to England less than a fortnight ago, yet within a few days of his arrival his erratic deliverances were again the theme of an impassioned eulogy in the "Spectator," and of muttered remonstrances in less devoted circles. The meekness of the Peers under the insolence of the Prime Minister proves the House of Lords to be indeed "a living Pantheon." There is something god-like in the immovable calm of the assembly. Last Friday, for example, Lord Cross, who until six months ago held the office of Lord Privy Seal, which is now adorned by Lord Salisbury, complained of an irregularity in Ministerial procedure, and his protest was supported by Lord Spencer. "If it will soothe you to have an apology," was the Premier's retort, "by all means take one. In fact, you may take a bushel." The "Spectator" reproves Lord Rosebery for the pertness which it says is sometimes associated with his wit, and on the other hand selects as the distinguishing quality of Lord Salisbury's least studied deliverances their invariable weightiness. If weightiness were synonymous with heaviness the criticism would be nearer the mark.

Frequently, however, the true distinguishing quality of Lord Salisbury's utterances is neither weightiness nor heaviness, but sheer flippancy. A specimen was given last Monday in a speech dealing with the request of the Bishop of Hereford for an enquiry into the evils of betting. In effect the Prime Minister told the Bishop he might have a bushel of enquiries, and that he would be none the better for them. To try to remedy an evil, he declared, was to advertise it, and therefore to aggravate it. But while Lord Salisbury dogmatised thus on the theory of the subject the extent of his practical knowledge was amusingly illustrated by one observation. "I am told," he innocently remarked, "that on Sunday mornings crowds of people gather round a man and give him tips." Even the bishops joined in the laughter evoked by this unconscious travesty. "Pay him for tips," mildly corrected Lord Tweedmouth. The Prime Minister accepted the correction and stuck to his argument. Committees might be appointed, and laws might be passed, but betting would still go on. Nevertheless, he disdainfully permitted the Bishop to have his committee.

As everyone had foreseen—except, perhaps, the leaders of the Opposition—the debate raised by Sir Henry Fowler on the Budget Bill proved a fiasco. Sir Henry's own speech was a courageous effort, courageous particularly in the determination with which it sought to ignore the very basis of the Budget. We have often heard of "Hamlet" without the eponymous hero, but can scarcely imagine what the emasculation would be like. Sir Henry Fowler's oration almost supplied the deficiency. He spoke for nearly an hour on the extravagance of military expenditure, while carefully excluding from the area of his strictures the £150,000,000 which stands to the account of the South African blunder. The result was an all-pervading sense of unreality, an impression of futility, even, let it be said, a consciousness of downright insincerity.

But for the manifestations of the Irish members, the Liberal spokesman would have been received in chilling silence. A faint counter cheer was evoked by the ironical acclamation of the Nationalists, but there was no heart in it. In the course of his speech Sir Henry made casual allusion to the absence of Sir William Harcourt, whom he described with propriety as his right hon. friend. Members who imagined rightly or wrongly that the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer's absence was not without a motive smiled broadly, and Sir Henry observed their mirth. At one point he turned on his political associates with a bold plea for tolerance: "You and I differ in our views on the war," he exclaimed, "but as I have never impugned your motives I ask for the same measure of consideration from you." Nobody desired to impugn Sir Henry's motives. The feeling on the Liberal side was simply one of chagrin that a champion of the war should have been chosen to lead the assault on a policy indissolubly bound up with the war.

Something like a groan escaped from the rank and file of the Opposition when Sir Henry in concluding his observations, urged that the amendment was not to be interpreted as a vote of want of confidence in the Government. "What else can it be?" demanded Sir M. Hicks-Beach, mockingly. "Your own Government went out on a snatch vote in supply—on a question of cordite—and yet you have the coolness to suggest that an amendment to the second reading of the Budget is a matter of no importance." The hollowness of the attack was further exposed by Mr. John Redmond, whose powerful if somewhat unpalatable exhortation to the Liberal party to abandon the delusions of political strategy and face once more the realities of life made a profound impression.

Considering the circumstances of the division the Ministerial majority must have been a disappointment to the Government. All the Nationalist members abstained, while among other Liberals who declined to vote were Sir William Harcourt, Mr. John Morley, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. John Burns, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. C. P. Scott, Mr. George Harwood, and Mr. Channing. Adding the absentee Liberals to the absentee Nationalists the Opposition suffered a diminution of its normal strength to the extent of nearly a hundred-

votes, yet the Government majority only rose to 177. Obviously, therefore, there were malcontents on both sides.

Statements made in both Houses on Tuesday night with reference to affairs in China indicate that the British Government is urging counsels of moderation in the dealings of the allied Powers with that country. There was one memorable phrase in Lord Cranborne's little speech —a phrase not to be found in the type-written document with which he had been fortified in advance by the Foreign Office. Six highly placed Chinese officials, he explained, had been executed for complicity in the assault on the Pekin Legations. "How executed?" enquired Mr. James Lowther. "Well," replied the Under-Secretary with delicate discrimination, "three were killed and three were permitted to commit suicide." The phrase must have reminded the Irish members of certain compatriots of their own who resorted to a similar expedient to "save themselves from slaughter." They rewarded Lord Cranborne for his naivete by cheering him to the echo.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

COMMERCIAL STAGNATION.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, May 4.

There is a lull in both Imperial and Provincial politics. The Olympians and the lesser Olympians are all away at their favourite summer haunts in the clouds till the great cloud-compelling Jove sends them down again with the rains. So for a month or six weeks at least, there will be little news. We had yesterday a gathering of the local "captains of industry." It was their annual field-day. The report was of a gloomy character. Continued depression seems to prevail in the cotton industry. The hostile condition of affairs in China has caused commercial stagnation. Want of confidence in the stability of the Chinese Government has dislocated trade. It was thought that with an abundant supply of cotton this season spinners would be able to earn a profit. But the present condition of affairs forbids such a prospect. Though the price of the raw staple is reasonable there is no margin as yet between it and the manufactured article. Almost nine-tenths of our mill concerns incurred heavy losses last year, and they are still in the throes of a crisis, which threatens to cripple their permanent industry. Some of the speakers referred to the increasing competition of Japanese yarn in China. The exports last year reached 4½ crores of rupees against 6½ crores of all descriptions of yarns exported from India. Again, in the opinion of others, the currency craze of the Government of India has had the distinctive effect of creating a bounty for Japan. The par of exchange was on the same footing as regards the Chinese dollar and tael, the Japanese yen and the Bombay rupee prior to the date of the closure of the mint. That par was destroyed after the closure with this net effect, that for every 100 yens laid down in Bombay the Japanese to-day can obtain a larger number of rupees than the Chinese dollar or taels. This artificial bounty, the result of the mischievous currency legislation of the Indian Government, has had the effect of stimulating exports of Japanese yarn in China. Thus Japan has become a formidable competitor with India. As India destroyed Lancashire trade in the coarser yarns 25 years ago, so Japan in its turn is now endeavouring to destroy India's trade in the same description of yarns. This is the impending danger unless Indian manufacturers again become successful in driving out Lancashire's trade with India in the finer counts. It looks as if the instinct of self-preservation will impel Bombay mill owners to go in largely by and by for finer yarns. But there is the difficulty of growing the longer-stapled variety of cotton. It is here the mill owners seem to be shortsighted. They have done next to nothing to improve the quality of the raw staple which has been deteriorating for some years past. The indigent rayat, hard pressed on all sides by the Sowcar and the State, has no means to buy good seeds. He borrows from the grasping bania and sows what he can get. The result is a poor quality. Now here the mill owners can combine and help the rayat in advancing him money to buy good seeds, well selected, at a moderate rate of interest, and if the loan is made repayable by easy instalments the rayat is sure to grow a better quality, for which he can get a better price. The mill owner would then be in a position to spin finer yarn and turn it into finer cloth. So far the mill owners of Bombay are shortsighted, and do not see their own interests.

Lastly, there was again a growl about the crushing incidence of the excise duty on Indian manufactured cloth. The depressed condition of the weaving industry is well known. Almost all the weaving mills have incurred losses. And one reason is that the Government sweeps away into its coffers fully fifty per cent. of the net profit on weaving. I need not go into the history of this taxation. It is well known. But I will repeat the argument which was urged at the mill owners' meeting. A concrete instance would better illustrate that argument. The duty is 3½ per cent. on the value of the goods as per tariff. Now the average selling price of ordinary cloth is 7½ annas per lb. One hundred lbs. will realise 750 annas. On this a duty of 3½ per cent. gives 26 annas. Now, it is well known that taking a good year with a bad one, the average net profit on cloth per lb. is ½ anna. On 100 lbs. the profit is 50 annas. Thus, while the profit is 50 annas, the Government sweeps away in duty as much as 26 annas, which is more than 50 per cent. Who has ever heard of such a confiscatory process in any other part of the world? Yet our paternal Government talks of developing the resources of the country and fostering its industries.

THE INDIAN FAMINE UNION.

INTERVIEW WITH SIR WILLIAM WEDDERBURN.

We have given in former issues of India some account of the steps taken towards the formation of an Indian Famine Union on the lines set forth by Sir William Wedderburn in recent letters to the "Times." As the movement is now taking definite shape, our readers in England and in India will be interested to learn what progress has been made, and in what directions the earliest developments may be expected. With the object of obtaining information upon these points, a representative of India waited upon Sir William Wedderburn, who is in London busily engaged in the promotion of the Union. The following is an account of the interview. The first question put by our representative was:—

"May I ask what progress has been made towards constituting the proposed Indian Famine Union?"

"The matter," Sir William replied, "is still in a fluid condition, but I hope that it will soon crystallise into shape. In the meantime satisfactory progress has been made in securing co-operation, and preparing the way for practical work. You will understand that in a movement of this kind, which seeks to approach a great national problem from the purely economic and philanthropic point of view, it is necessary to obtain the co-operation of the best men who are acquainted with, and interested in, Indian affairs, irrespective of party politics. Then, if we wish to create in this country an enlightened and helpful public opinion regarding Indian conditions, we must try to bring into our Union some of the chief authorities in economic science. Again, the philanthropic public must be appealed to through its recognised leaders. And above all it is important to secure the services, as a leader, of some distinguished public man, whose name is well known to the British public, and who is qualified to speak on both Indian and economic subjects. To find anyone so qualified, and to persuade him to undertake so onerous and responsible a duty, is no easy task. But we have approached Mr. Leonard Courtney, and he is kindly considering our request that he will give our movement the benefit of his wide experience and influence. You are, of course, aware of the prominent part he took in the work of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and that it was on his motion that the Commission agreed to the financial concessions embodied in the Majority Report. As regards procedure, it has been considered advisable to hold a preliminary conference of a few of those having special ex-

perience of Indian affairs, and at this conference Mr. Courtney has consented to take the chair. The meeting will be of an informal character, and it is proposed to hold it at the Westminster Palace Hotel on the 7th of June, that is, immediately after the Whitsuntide holidays."

"Are you at liberty to indicate the nature of the resolutions to be then brought forward?"

"The idea is to form a Provisional Committee, with a view to constituting the Union on a good practical basis; the intention being to limit action strictly to one definite object, viz., 'the investigation of the causes of famine, and possible means of prevention.' The question of famine relief would not come within the scope of our enquiry. Probably one of the first proposals would be to ask the Government to assist us by supplying the detailed facts regarding the present economic condition of the cultivating class and their dependents. We believe that the India Office will be willing to place very valuable information at our disposal for this purpose. There have been economic enquiries in past years, notably those in connexion with the Deccan agrarian riots in 1875; the enquiries following on the Famine Commission's report in 1881 and 1887; and the report of Mr. Thorburn in 1896 on the indebtedness of the Punjab peasantry, which had an important bearing on the recent legislation regarding land alienation in the Punjab. But these enquiries refer to the condition of the people before the recent aggravated famines, and they were mostly conducted for local purposes not immediately connected with the question of famine prevention. We, therefore, hope to persuade the Government to grant a special enquiry which will give us, in a manageable form, the facts regarding the actual present condition of the rayats in certain selected areas of the famine districts. An exact diagnosis is necessary before any remedies can be applied."

"How do you propose that the question of remedies should be approached?"

"The remedies that have been suggested are numerous: agricultural banks, irrigation, technical education, village industries, arbitration courts, administrative reforms; these and others are useful remedies, to be applied according to circumstances, which differ much in the various provinces. Also different people believe in different remedies, and if the Union is a success, I should suggest that it should work by committees taking up these different lines of treatment, reading and debating papers at open meetings, and working out practical schemes. We have in this country many experts in Indian matters, and it is really extraordinary that, looking to our vast national stake in India, so little scientific interest should be shown in these vital economic problems. One of the most important directions in which a remedy is sought for the cultivator's difficulties has reference to the tenure of land, as dealt with by the Punjab Alienation Act. No one has made more diligent enquiry into this matter than Mr. Thorburn, and he has agreed to read a paper on the subject before the E. I. Association; this will, I believe, be on the 24th of June, and will furnish an excellent opportunity of opening up one side of the agrarian problem. We wish it to be clearly understood that the present movement has for its object to co-operate with the Government. All those who have been officially connected with Indian affairs know how incessant and overwhelming are the daily current duties of civil officers in India. We cordially recognise the energy and ability with which, under Lord Curzon's direction, the relief operations have been conducted; and we think that, with the comparative leisure at their disposal, many retired Indian officials may do good service to the people among whom they have spent the best years of their life."

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

418,000 PERSONS ON RELIEF.

PUBLICATION OF TELEGRAMS RESUMED.

We are glad to say that our efforts to secure a renewal of the publication of the weekly telegrams from the Viceroy regarding the famine have been successful.

The India Office on Monday night issued the following telegram from the Viceroy of India, dated May 20, concerning the present position of the famine districts:—

"Number of persons in receipt of relief: Bombay 344,000 Bombay Native States 29,000, Baroda 21,000, Hyderabad 14,000, Madras 5,000, Central India States 4,000, Central Provinces 1,000; total 418,000."

The figures for the preceding week will be found in our Parliamentary report, in Lord George Hamilton's reply to Mr. Schwann's question.

OPINIONS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

The "Morning Leader" wrote (May 17):—

Mr. Schwann did a public service yesterday in asking Lord George Hamilton why telegrams from the Viceroy regarding the progress of famine in India have not for some weeks past been communicated to the British Press. The last telegram which was permitted to appear was dated, we think, February 18—just three months ago. At that time there were nearly a quarter of a million of people in receipt of relief, and the Viceroy stated that greater pressure was expected in the affected area after the reaping of the scanty harvests there. In other words, it was tolerably obvious that India was threatened with another period of serious famine, especially in the Bombay Presidency. But then the supply of official telegrams to the Press suddenly ceased, and the British public, always unduly prone to optimistic views about India, was allowed to suppose that the famine was over. It was about as much "over" as the war. From the Indian journals we see that the numbers on relief have been mounting up, while the Mansion House Fund has been closed, and the public at home has been lulled into indifference. As a result of Mr. Schwann's timely question Lord George Hamilton undertakes now to resume the publication of the official telegrams which he must have been receiving regularly. Publication ought never to have ceased. But really the attitude of the India Office in this appalling business baffles us. One of its duties is to represent here the interests of the unrepresented taxpayers of India who pay its handsome salaries and maintain its costly building. But, instead of that we see it one day deprecating a Mansion House Fund, another day suppressing important information, another day resisting enquiry into the economic causes of famine. The professions of the India Office are magnificent. But we must say that its conduct too often suggests the hireling "whose own the sheep are not."

The "Investors' Review" wrote (May 18):—

So Lord George Hamilton has been quietly suppressing the weekly Viceregal telegrams descriptive of the progress of this scourge in order not to alarm the public mind, or to deepen the impression that the present Government of this country is about the weakest and most helpless on record. We thank Mr. Schwann for extracting from his lordship a promise that publication will be resumed. It is to be so because the number of persons on relief is now increasing. Owing to the failure of spring crops through the deficiency of winter rains, his lordship explained, serious scarcity prevails in parts of the Bombay Presidency, Bombay Native States, and Baroda. But he hastens to add that although increasing, the scourge is much less severe than was expected three months back. When, we wonder, did the Government make known that expectation. We have no recollection of any warning of the kind, but remember vividly enough Lord George Hamilton's deprecation of too much zeal in subscribing to famine funds and the comfortable optimism of Sir Edward Law's Budget. It is poor consolation to be told that outside the Bombay Presidency and Native States scarcity does not prevail "to any considerable extent." What is the meaning of that phrase? It savours of the full-fed director reassuring shareholders in a bankrupt company. The figures given in the Viceroy's telegram of May 14 proclaim a total of 381,000 stricken by famine and in receipt of public help. Of these 312,000 are in the Bombay Presidency, 25,000 in Bombay Native States, 21,000 in Baroda, 12,000 in Hyderabad, 6,000 in Madras, 4,000 in Central India States, and 1,000 in the Central Provinces. From now on we expect to see ominous increases in these figures.

The "Daily News" (May 17) said:—

How comes it that for the past three months we have had none of the usual weekly telegrams from the Viceroy of India summarising the facts about the famine? Lord Curzon, if we are not greatly mistaken, keeps the India Office regularly informed, but for some reason or other the information has not since the middle of February been communicated to the newspapers. The suppression of the news is the more remarkable, and regrettable, as the last published telegram was of a somewhat alarming kind. It predicted a serious renewal of the famine, which has already lasted continuously for a couple of years. Mr. Schwann put a question upon the matter to Lord George Hamilton in the House of Commons yesterday. He wanted to know (1) why the regular supply of official telegrams to the newspapers had been discontinued, and (2) what

is the present condition of the famine districts. Lord George Hamilton's answer was as evasive as answers from the India Office commonly are. But we are glad to see that Mr. Schwann elicited an undertaking that the publication of the telegrams shall forthwith be resumed. Lord George Hamilton suggests that the resumption is only now necessary because the famine is becoming rather more serious. But that will not do. Though the India Office has suppressed the telegrams here, the Indian and the Anglo-Indian journals have not ceased to publish the facts, and it is clear from them that the increase of the number of persons in receipt of relief is not a thing of yesterday. The present Government's habit of sitting on inconvenient facts has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished. It is specially culpable in regard to India, because under any circumstances the public at home is disposed to excessive cheerfulness where India is concerned.

BRITISH INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

DISABILITIES IN THE TRANSVAAL AND THE ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

[From a Correspondent.]

Durban, April 20.

The position of the British Indians in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony is sufficiently serious to call for a statement. Mr. Chamberlain lately announced that the legislation of the late South African Republic and the Orange Free State would, "so far as possible," be adopted by the Imperial Government. The question at once arose in the minds of Indians here whether the anti-Indian legislation of the old Governments was included in the qualifying clause "so far as possible." If the present régime is any test of the future, then, indeed, the question has been solved for them to the horror of every Indian in South Africa. The whole of the anti-Indian legislation in the Transvaal is being enforced with a rigour unknown before. The laxity of the late Government was totally in their favour. Though the Location Law was there, and the cab regulations, footpath, and numerous other bye-laws existed in the Statute-Book, they were more or less a dead letter. The enforcement of the Location Law, although often threatened, was never carried out against respectable Indians. The storekeepers and others, and only a few—very few—actually suffered the indignity of the footpath and other bye-laws. All is now changed. Every anti-Indian ordinance of the late Government is being unearthed, and with strict British regularity applied to the victims. The handful of poor Indians that were unable to leave the Transvaal before the war broke out, and who are therefore now there, have protested against the enforcement, but so far in vain. The following telegram was forwarded to his Excellency the High Commissioner on March 25 last:—

> To Private Secretary, His Excellency High Commissioner. Some British Indians, who are at present in Pretoria and Johannesburg, write to Indian Refugee Committee saying they have received notice to remove to locations. They are not allowed walk on footpaths, and that generally anti-Indian laws of the late Republic are being strictly enforced. I am requested respectfully to draw His Excellency's attention to the admission of his Majesty's Government that such laws are objectionable, and the statement that they would endeavour to have them repealed. The laws, it appears, were never under the old regime enforced as they now are, and pending general settlement Committee prays for relief.

We are anxiously awaiting reply. The protests against such legislation made by the then British Agent, as well as the Secretary of State for the Colonies, had much to do with the laxity of the Republican officials above alluded to. Mr. Chamberlain's reply, from which the following extracts are taken, to the Indian memorialists as to the Location Law was very sympathetic, and shows clearly that he strongly disapproved of it, and stopped only when he felt helpless.

> I regret extremely that I cannot return a more encouraging answer to the memorial before me, for the petitioners have my sympathy. I believe them to be a peaceable, law-abiding, and meritorious body of persons, and I can only hope that, even as matters stand, their undoubted industry and intelligence, and their indomitable perseverance, will suffice to overcome any obstacles which may now face them in the pursuit of their avocations.
>
> In conclusion, I would say that, whilst desirous loyally to abide by the award and to allow it to close the legal and international questions in dispute between the two Governments, I reserve to myself the liberty, later on, to make friendly representations to the South African Republic as to these traders, and possibly to invite that Government to consider whether, when once its legal position has been made good, it would not be wise to review the situation from a new point of view, and decide whether it would not be better in the interests of its own burghers to treat the Indians more generously, and to free itself from even the appearance of countenancing a trade jealousy, which I have some reasons to believe does not emanate from the governing class in the Republic.

Are the Indians then, when everything is in his power, to groan under all the disabilities which so roused his indignation? Even a few weeks before the war broke out, the British Agent assured the deputation that waited on him at Pretoria that everything short of a declaration of war was done by him, that negotiations were still going on, and that if unfortunately the threatened war broke out they need not bother further about the matter. Lord Lansdowne has declared publicly that the anti-Indian legislation was one of the principal causes of the war. Is, then, the very evil, to remove which among others the war has been entered upon, to be continued under the very shadow of the British flag, and when the Colonial Office cannot even put forth the excuse that it has not sufficient control over the self-governing Colonies? For neither the Transvaal nor the Orange River Colony has yet got self-government.

Indians here notice with much regret and misgiving that the King's speech at the opening of Parliament pointedly refers to the equality of all the "white" races south of the Zambezi, and a fair treatment of the Native races, as the only objects in view at the time of the coming settlement. Before the war it used to be "equal rights for all the civilised races in South Africa." If, therefore, the change to "the whites" is deliberate, it suggests a cause for grave anxiety.

Below is an abstract of the laws of the late Republican States affecting the Indians. The question is most serious, their position most painful. Labouring under the oppressive yoke they feel too exhausted to make an effort. They can only cry out in anguish. They have done everything to deserve better treatment. They have taken their share, however humble, side by side with the European Colonists in the war, and have endeavoured to show that if they are anxious to be allowed the rights and privileges of British subjects they are not unmindful of their duty as such. They have shown also, incontestably, that there is absolutely nothing in them to justify all the indignities they have to suffer in South Africa.

Here is an abstract of the laws of the late South African Republic and the Orange Free State, so far as they affect Indians:—

SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLIC:

Every Indian must take out a Registration Ticket for £3.

When the officials treated the Indians as the natives of the soil, they insisted upon their taking out shilling travelling passes.

The railway regulations prevent Indians from travelling first or second class.

No Indian can own native gold, or take out a digging licence. (This law has not operated as a hardship, as the Indians have not gone in for speculation.)

Law 3 of 1885 gives the Government the right to point out to the Indians, for sanitary purposes, certain locations for habitation. An attempt was made before the war to send away all the Indians in Johannesburg to a location nearly five miles from the centre part of the town, where it was proposed to restrict their trade also.

Certain bye-laws in Pretoria prevent the use, by the Indians, of footpaths and public vehicles.

ORANGE FREE STATE:

Chapter 33 of 1890 prevents any Asiatics from (1) remaining in the State for more than two months without permission from the State President; (2) owning landed property; (3) trading or farming.

Chapter 71 levies a poll tax of 10s. per annum when permission to reside has been granted, subject to restrictions mentioned above.

"PERMITS" REFUSED TO INDIANS.

REPLIES TO REPRESENTATIONS.

[From a Correspondent.]

Durban, April 27.

Day by day the list of the Europeans receiving "permits" to go to the Transvaal is swelling; but up to the time of writing not one "permit" has been granted for the Indian refugees. Representations were made to Lord Roberts when he was in South Africa, also to the High Commissioner, but all without avail. Mr. H. T. Ommanney (retired I.C.S.), who has been appointed Permit Secretary to the High Commissioner, has been endeavouring to secure some for the Indians, and last month even went so far as to telegraph for one representative merchant's name from Durban, the other being from Capetown. A name was then and there submitted to him under protest that one permit was almost useless, but even that has not been granted.

With reference to the letter sent last week I enclose herewith copies of the replies received to the representations made by the few British Indians who are at present in Pretoria and Johannesburg, and who were unable to leave the Transvaal before hostilities broke out:—

Imperial Government, Municipality,
Johannesburg,
24th November, 1900.

To Messrs. N. G. Desai, and other Petitioners,
P.O. Box 3348, Johannesburg.

Sirs,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 22nd inst. The Regulations to which you refer were passed by the late Town Council, and it is not the intention of the military authorities

to alter any regulations which existed before the date of British occupation.

I beg to suggest that a petition of a similar nature should be sent to the first Town Council appointed.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed), O'MEARA MAJOR,
Acting Burgomaster.

From Supervisor of Indian Immigrants,
Pretoria, March 15, 1901.
To E. Osman Latiff,
P.O. Box 4420, Johannesburg.

I beg to inform you that the "Military Governor's" former decision remains unaltered in so much as all "Asiatics," Hindus and Mahomedans, that are in Pretoria "now" must reside in the Coolie Location. As regards Asiatic general dealers, "in a big way," their request to reside in the town may be considered, but as none of such a class are at present in Pretoria the order stands that all Asiatics at present in Pretoria must reside in the Location. The Military Governor has kindly sanctioned that two men may reside in the "Mosque" to look after the same. I have this day ordered all Asiatics at present residing in the town to go and live in the Location.

(Signed), J. A. GILLAM.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI AND LORD G. HAMILTON.

(*Continued from page* 238.)

Washington House,
72, Anerley Park, S.E.
December 4, 1900.

My Lord,—As I have already acknowledged in P.S. of 28th ult., in my letter of 26th ult., I have received your letter of November, 1900 (J. and P. 1995).

I am doubly thankful for it, because you have favoured me with a reply and you have fairly raised the issue between Britain and India.

Your lordship refers me to an extract from Sir Henry Fowler's speech. Not only has Sir Henry Fowler, but other Secretaries also have expressed themselves similarly. But in doing so they have begged the whole question.

The fairness with which you have replied makes me hopeful that our correspondence will not be in vain.

To come to a clear understanding it is necessary that we should consider the issues in a systematic manner, beginning with the fundamental issue upon which the whole relation between Britain and India depends. My remarks refer only to British India, and I shall confine myself to this fundamental issue. During sixty-seven years past the British nation have given the following "solemn pledges":—

Act of Parliament, 1833 (India): "That no Native of the said territories, nor any natural-born subject of his Majesty resident therein, shall by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the said Company." (The Company's duties were transferred to the Crown.)

The Queen's Proclamation of 1858: "We hold ourselves bound to the Natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects, and these obligations, by the blessing of Almighty God, we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil. And it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects, of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified, by their education, ability, and integrity, duly to discharge. When, by the blessing of Providence, internal tranquillity shall be restored, it is our earnest desire to stimulate . . . . and to administer its government for the benefit of all our subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our strength; in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward. And may the God of all power grant to us and to those in authority under us strength to carry out these our wishes for the good of our people."

Lord Lytton (the Viceroy), on the assumption of the title of Empress, January 1, 1877, at the Delhi Assemblage: "But you, the Natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed, have a recognised claim to share largely with your English fellow-subjects, according to your capacity for the task, in the administration of the country you inhabit. This claim is founded in the highest justice. It has been repeatedly affirmed by British and Indian statesmen and by the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. It is recognised by the Government of India as binding on its honour, and consistent with all the aims of its policy."

Lord Lytton (the Viceroy), as Chancellor of the Calcutta University, March, 1877: "The Proclamation of the Queen contains solemn pledges, spontaneously given, and founded upon the highest justice."

Jubilee of 1887: The Queen-Empress, in reply to the Jubilee Address of Congratulation of the Bombay Municipal Corporation: "Allusion is made to the Proclamation issued on the occasion of my assumption of the direct government of India as the charter of the liberties of the Princes and peoples of India. It has always been and will be continued to be my earnest desire that the principles of that Proclamation should be unswervingly maintained."

Now the fundamental question is whether all these "solemn pledges" are to be "faithfully and conscientiously" fulfilled or not. That they have not been hitherto "faithfully and conscientiously" fulfilled is simple fact; and this has been acknowledged by English official statesmen themselves.

It is not my intention to cry over the past. I am only looking to the future. I give below the acknowledgments of the violation of these pledges.

Soon after the great gracious Proclamation of 1858, a Committee of five members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India,[1] in their report of January 20, 1860, acknowledged that the British Government were "exposed to the charge of keeping promises to the ear and breaking to the hope," and this confession is made twenty-seven years after the Act of 1833, and within two years of the great Proclamation of 1858. This was said forty years ago and the charge remains the same to-day.

The Duke of Argyll in his speech on March 11, 1869, confessed, "I must say that we have not fulfilled our duty or the promises and engagements which we have made."

Lord Lytton in a note of May 30, 1878, said:—"No sooner was the Act (1833) passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it . . . . are all so many deliberate and transparent subterfuges for stultifying the Act and reducing it to a dead letter. Since I am writing confidentially, I do not hesitate to say that both the Governments of England and of India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear."

When these pledges were given all considerations were thoroughly gone into. It will be remembered that when the clause in the Act of 1833, was before Parliament, all the various considerations, even to the extreme one of losing India, were fully discussed.

The case of the Proclamation is still far stronger. It was made at a most critical time, when the dangers and the very disaster, which are now latent in the excuses to justify its violation, had actually just happened, and with the actual experience of the disaster fresh before their eyes, the Queen and the British nation proclaimed the noblest and the highest pledges, the like of which no great and powerful nation has ever given before.

This Proclamation, and its subsequent confirmations in 1877 and 1887, were made by Conservative Secretaries of State under Conservative Governments.

Can it be said that our Gracious Sovereign lent herself to a deceitful action when she issued the noblest proclamation of the world, in words solemn and divine, and invoked the help of God for the fulfilment of her wishes for the good of her people, in the face of the Mutiny fresh before her? That is not to be even dreamt of.

It is of the first and highest importance to both Britain and India that this fundamental issue must be first clearly settled. This done, the design and details of the superstructure can be easily considered, as also the consequences of the decision.

Judging from your lordship's last letter I fully hope that you will fairly face this issue.

Yours truly,
DADABHAI NAOROJI.

The Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P.,
India Office, S.W.

India Office,
December 6, 1900.

Sir,—I write briefly to acknowledge your two letters, and my reply must, so far as I am concerned, be the end of the correspondence you have initiated.

You advance various contentions, all of which seem to me to be based upon a curious misinterpretation of language or disregard of acknowledged and existing conditions. You announce yourself as a sincere supporter of British rule; you vehemently denounce the conditions and consequences which are inseparable from the maintenance of that rule.

The British Government have over and over again publicly laid down the principle that when any Native of India is by character, ability, and knowledge qualified to perform administrative or other functions he shall not be disqualified merely by his religion or race. The declarations referred to were the announcements, wise and beneficent, of the policy that in the future government of British India the officials who should take part in its administration should not be exclusively European but an admixture of the inhabitants of Great Britain and the Natives of India; the proportion the one should bear to the other, or the tests or qualifications by which they were to be selected, were deliberately left to be decided by the experience of future Governments. That policy has been continuously followed and expanded; the number of Europeans has been diminished, and the number of Natives largely

[1] Sir J. Willoughby, Mr. Mangles, Mr. Arbuthnot, Mr. MacNaughton, Sir Erskine Perry.

increased. Subject to the one condition, which must necessarily prevail so long as India is under the direct government of the Crown, that a certain proportion of the higher administrative posts must be filled by Europeans, there is no limit to the employment Natives of India may in the future obtain in the increasing number of Government appointments. You allude in passing to "the foolish and suicidal sedition law." Again you seem to be under a hallucination. The law of sedition in India is the same as the law of sedition in this country; and milder in its definition and application than those of any of the great Governments of Europe. You seem to think that a free press means that pressmen are free from the restraint of the ordinary law of the land, and at liberty through their newspapers to advocate assassination, outrage, and racial disturbance and riot. For these offences alone have prosecutions been instituted. You speak of the increasing impoverishment of India and of the annual drain upon her as steadily and continuously exhausting her resources. Again I assert you are under a delusion. Except that during the last five years the rainfalls have thrice failed, and created droughts of immense dimensions, there is not a fact to be found in support of these allegations. India is a very poor country if we take her population and area into account, but tested by every criterion that modern science or research can suggest the condition of the great mass of the population has steadily improved during the last forty years. Heavy annual remittances have to be made to this country for monies borrowed and services rendered, but the increase of wealth and material prosperity annually given to India by the multifarious benefits of British administration far outweigh the remittances so made.

I do not for a moment doubt your wish to serve India, but to effectively perform any work of that kind facts must be faced and hallucinations dismissed. I am most sincerely anxious to do everything I can to benefit India, and I cordially welcome co-operation from any quarter. I readily admit there may be flaws in our system, and that in various branches of legislation, administration and research, improvements and innovations may be instituted of value and advantage. But I attach even more importance to promoting cordial and sympathetic relations between Europeans and Natives, between governors and governed. Wholesale denunciations of British rule, crude allegations of violation of faith, charges of robbery and spoliation, attempts to associate periodic visitations of pestilence and famine with the system of land assessment in India—these and similar indictments can but widen and aggravate existing differences.

Parliament and the people of this country are profoundly anxious to do their duty towards India, but they are justly proud of the Government and the Services they have in India established. Their sympathies are alienated and good intentions arrested by these unjust and exaggerated attacks upon their countrymen in India who are carrying out duties and functions of unprecedented responsibility and magnitude. Therefore I trust that these admonitions, given in no unfriendly spirit, may induce you and those who work with you to alter their methods of controversy, so that we may for the future be enabled to work, if not in co-operation, at least not in open antagonism, and that in criticising any defects and shortcomings of our Indian system, full credit may at the same time be given for the infinite and far-reaching benefits it has conferred upon the many peoples and creeds of India.

I remain,
Yours faithfully,
George Hamilton.

Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq.

Washington House,
72, Anerley Park, S.E.
December 11, 1900.

My Lord,—I have received your letter of 6th inst. with again double thankfulness for favouring me with a reply, and far more so for expressing your views still more clearly.

I would pass over subordinate matters like that of the present sedition law, etc. I shall confine myself to the main difference between us.

You have brought the whole main contention between us to a focus in one sentence. You say to me:—

"You announce yourself as a sincere supporter of British rule: you vehemently denounce the conditions and consequences which are inseparable from the maintenance of that rule."

This shows you have not sufficiently known my views. I repeat that I am a sincere supporter of British rule, *i.e.*, of true British rule founded upon honourable, "faithful and conscientious fulfilment" of "solemn pledges." I denounce the present system, which is not British rule, but an un-British, despotic and destructive system, which, in its declaration of policy, is based upon solemn pledges, but which in its actual practice is conducted upon the violation of those pledges.

The conditions which you lay down as necessary for the maintenance of British rule in India are exactly the conditions which in their consequences will destroy, instead of maintaining, British rule in India.

The only condition upon which British rule can be maintained in India, with benefit to both countries, is the honourable, "faithful and conscientious fulfilment" of the solemn pledges so repeatedly given to the Indians in the face of the world.

Now the most important and vital principle, the very soul of these pledges, is that there shall be no race distinction; while the fundamental principle upon which all arrangements are made under the present system is either putting subtlely by "subterfuges" the Indians at serious difficulties and disadvantages, or openly making race distinctions so as to exclude the Indians as Indians.

Either the solemn pledges mean what they say, and the present system is a deliberate violation of them; or these pledges are a sham and delusion to deceive the Indians and the world, and are not intended to mean what they say.

The position must be cleared up. The Indian people must know this.

If these pledges mean what they say, then by all means lay down whatever conditions you like for a fair comparison of the mental, moral and physical qualifications, capacity, character and merit, of all her Majesty's subjects alike—and not the exclusion of her Majesty's Indian subjects because they are Indians. Here, my lord, lies our chief difference.

The true conditions have been made perfectly plain by the gracious Proclamation itself, as to the foundations of the maintenance of British rule; of its "strength," "security," and "reward." Not upon the violation of the Proclamation itself. The Sovereign founds these results upon this noble declaration, worthy of the British name, British character, and British civilisation—words conceived and proclaimed for the first time I think in the history of all the great Empires of the world. These are the noble words:—"In their prosperity will lie our *strength*, in their *contentment* our security, and in their *gratitude* our best *reward*."

The violation of these pledges can only result in adversity, discontent and rebellion. There can be no other results. And you yourself have made this clear:—"Our rule will never be popular," or words to that effect. You are perfectly right. The present system of violation of solemn pledges can never be popular; and what is not popular can never last. "*In their contentment* our *security*," not in their discontent.

My Lord, it is necessary to settle first this vital difference between us. The conditions you lay down will, far from maintaining British rule, destroy it.

On the other hand the conditions laid down in the "solemn pledges" are the only conditions to maintain the "strength," "security," and "reward" of the British rule.

If a definite understanding can be come to on this fundamental difference, then we consider the next question, viz. (to use Sir Stafford Northcote's — Lord Iddesleigh's — words), "Should at once afford a guarantee for the good government of the people, and for the security of British rights and interests," consistently with the faithful and conscientious fulfilment of the solemn pledges.

I do hope and trust that you will calmly consider the whole position so as to secure and preserve the honour, the strength, the security and the reward of the British rule, and the same time the material and moral elevation of the Indian people.

My observations do not apply to the Native States, but only to the British Indian subjects at present.

I remain,
Yours faithfully,
Dadabhai Naoroji.

Rt. Hon. Lord George Hamilton, M.P.,
India Office, S.W.

(*To be continued.*)

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, May 16.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A BISHOPRIC IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCES.

Mr. Caine asked the Secretary of State for India if it was intended to establish a bishopric in the Central Provinces of India; and, if so, what cost would it involve to the Indian Exchequer.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have not been officially informed of the intention to establish a Bishopric in the Central Provinces, but I have reason to think that such a step is contemplated. If established, it will involve no expenditure from Indian revenues in excess of the existing arrangements.

THE PROGRESS OF FAMINE.
381,000 PERSONS ON RELIEF.
SUPPRESSION OF TELEGRAMS TO CEASE.

Mr. Schwann asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could explain why telegrams from the Viceroy regarding the progress of famine in India had not for some weeks past been communicated to the British Press: And, whether he would state what was the present condition of the famine districts and the number of persons in receipt of relief at the present time in each of them separately.

Lord G. Hamilton: The communication of the official

famine telegrams to the Press was discontinued about three months ago, when the number of persons on relief had become comparatively very small. As it is now increasing, the publication will be resumed. Owing to the failure of spring crops through the deficiency of winter rains, serious scarcity prevails in parts of the Bombay Presidency, Bombay Native States, and Baroda, though the distress, I am glad to say, is much less than was expected three months back. Outside the Bombay Presidency and Native States scarcity does not prevail to any considerable extent. The numbers on relief, as telegraphed by the Viceroy on May 14, are:—Bombay, 312,000; Bombay Native States, 25,000; Baroda, 21,000; Haidarabad, 12,000; Madras, 6,000; Central India States, 4,000; Central Provinces, 1,000—Total, 381,000.

Friday, May 17.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

RUBBER-PRODUCING TREES.

Mr. Sharpe asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could state what steps, if any, the Indian Government was taking to develop the cultivation of rubber-producing trees in Burma: Was he aware that in Ceylon and other eastern Colonies attempts were being made by private proprietors to develop the same cultivation; and would he say what precautions, if any, it was proposed to take to prevent the results of the Government operations interfering with the success of private enterprise.

Lord G. Hamilton: The Government of India have recently authorized an extensive experimental plantation of the Para rubber tree in the Tenasserim Division of Burma, where the climate and other conditions are believed to be favourable. I am aware that attempts are being made to develop the production of rubber in Ceylon and elsewhere by private enterprise, but I do not think that this is a reason why the Government of India should not do their best to develop the resources of that country and encourage private enterprise by showing that this tree can be profitably cultivated in parts of India.

Monday, May 20.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE VICTORIA TECHNICAL INSTITUTE. WHY NOT AN INDIAN INSTRUCTOR?

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree asked the Secretary of State for India seeing that the Victoria Technical Institute of Bombay was an establishment carried on at public expense and under the management or control of Government, could he state why a mechanical engineer was being sent out from Europe for the training of students in that institution in theoretical and practical mechanical engineering at a salary of about £300 per annum; and whether an engineer fit to give such training could not be secured in India: And, if not, would he state if the Government of India contemplates action in the direction of providing such engineering and other technical instruction as might supply hereafter teachers of the capacity required in the instance mentioned from among the people of that country.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have no information as to any request from the Victoria Technical Institute that a mechanical engineer may be sent out from this country. The Institute, as my hon. friend is no doubt aware, though aided by Government funds, is not a Government institution, but is administered by a Board. The list of teachers appears to show that most of them are Natives of India. Engineering and technical instruction is already supported by Government at four Engineering Colleges in India, and at several technical schools. I have no doubt that, among the persons trained in these institutions, some will be fit to become teachers, although it may still be desirable from time to time to obtain instructors from Europe.

REVIVAL OF INDIGENOUS INDUSTRIES.

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree asked the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that Mr. Chatterton, of the Madras School of Arts, had drawn up a memorandum in reference to a project undertaken by the Government of India with the view to encourage a revival of the indigenous manual industries of the country, whether he would state what funds were intended to be devoted annually for this purpose and what were the details of its working; and would he place the papers relating thereto upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have seen a copy of the Memorandum to which my hon. friend refers in the newspapers, and I believe the question of taking further steps for the development and revival of indigenous manual industries in India is under the consideration of the Viceroy and his colleagues; but I have no official information on the subject. When I learn the result of the deliberations of the Government of India I shall be glad to communicate it to my hon. friend.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS.

Notice has been given of the following Questions:—

Sir John Leng,—To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Government of India, pursuant to Lord Curzon's wish to extend economically constructed lines in the rural districts, has signified its willingness to accept the co-operation of local Indian capitalists in the promotion of such light railways, and also in the construction of district and village works for water storage and irrigation channels: Has it been brought to his notice that early in 1899 a company or syndicate applied to the Indian Government for sanction to construct several light railway lines in or adjoining the district of Ganjam in the northern portion of the Madras Presidency, most of which lines would serve as feeders to the East Coast Railway; that revised estimates amounting to 14 lakhs for the construction of one of these projected lines, 47 miles in length, intended to connect Russeli-coonda, near Ganjam, with the coast, were submitted many months ago; and why the Government approval or disapproval has been delayed: And, seeing that one such light railway has been laid already by a local zemindar up to the limits of his own domain, the syndicate being willing to extend it further, can he say when a decision upon these proposals may be expected.—(Thursday, May 23.)

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree,—To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, if, with the British occupation of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, the various regulations by which the Boer administrations had sought to impose disabilities on British Indian subjects residing in that region are invalidated; and, if not, having regard to the fact that such regulations were in breach of the Pretoria Convention, will he authorise the administrators in those Colonies to publicly declare that all such regulations would have no effect from the date of their passing under British domination.—(Friday, May 24.)

Mr. Yerburgh,—To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he can state the total number of men now required for the Indian reliefs to set free all men in that country who have completed their period of colour service.—(Thursday, May 23.)

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON ON INDIA.

The Mayor of Kensington (Sir H. Seymour King, M.P.) on Wednesday night entertained at dinner a large number of guests, including the principal Anglo-Indians resident in the old Palace suburb. Among those present were Lord George Hamilton, M.P., Secretary of State for India; Sir James Fergusson, M.P., Sir A. Lyall, Sir Henry W. Norman, Sir H. G. Walpole, General Sir J. J. H. Gordon, Sir James Westland, Sir T. C. Hope, Sir J. H. Morris, Sir Charles Stevens, Sir M. Bhownaggree, M.P., Colonel Sir W. S. S. Bissett, Lieutenant-Colonel D. M. Lumsden, the Rev. Canon Pennefather, and others.

The Chairman proposed "Our Empire of India," mentioning that Kensington was peculiarly fortunate in having within its borders a large proportion of Anglo-Indians. He hoped to interest their trained intellects in the Municipal affairs of his borough. (Applause.)

Lord George Hamilton, who responded, said that when he accepted that invitation he did not anticipate the ordeal which faced him. He had no idea of the extent of the Borough of Kensington, and that it contained the elite of the services of India. (Hear, hear.) He, therefore, suddenly found himself in the position of making a speech on a most important subject before the most critical audience in the Empire. If the toast of "The Empire" was worth anything, the conduct of a large portion of the Indian dependency was worth the greatest admiration, because of the way in which they had met the difficulties of the past year. He had never visited India, but one thing that struck him as wonderful was our government of that country. Our government there was one of anomalies and contradictions. We were a self-governing people, but it was under an Act of Parliament of this democratic people that we governed autocratically a vast territory whose people had opinions as shifting and changeable as the sands of the sea. That was wholly due to the good sense of the British people. He ventured to say that the first function of the Secretary of State for India was so to manage affairs that there should be no excuse for Parliamentary interference. (Cheers.) He complained of the amount of office work in India, which was only overcome by great emergencies when the Military and the Civil Office stood, like the prophet of old, between the living and the dead. (Cheers.) The misfortunes of India during the last three years had brought the governing and the governed bodies very much closer together, and the feeling had been enhanced by the work of Lord Curzon. (Cheers.) He pointed out that on no occasion had the House of Commons reversed a decision of the Indian Government. We could not rely upon either race or religion for our hold on India. He mentioned the cotton duties as an instance of the diversity of interests with which a Secretary of State had to deal. They could not venture on differential duties, and, as it had happened, both the Lancashire and the Indian trades had increased, and when the famine broke out no part of the Empire contributed so highly to the funds as Lancashire. (Cheers.) He praised highly the action of the Indian Volunteers in South Africa and the Indian troops in China. They had reorganised the Civil Service of India, created a new Army and a judicial service, and he was rejoiced, as one who had spent the greater part of his life in an armchair at the India Office, to meet the men who had done all that. As for the future, they had to face the political aspirations of the Natives, due to the educational system which we had introduced and the free Press which we had permitted. Nothing was more constant to his mind than Sir Henry Maine's simile of the captain of a ship navigating a stagnant sea. The problem before all Anglo-Indians was to take out of the Indian civilisation the best for the country, taking due account of the fact that what was suitable for England was of no value for India. The chief thing to remember was that British influence to be supreme must rest on Native sentiment and Native esteem. (Cheers.)

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.
Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.
Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Politics. A Series of Papers on Important Indian Questions by Prominent Congressmen. Post free, 4s. 4d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.
The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.
A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.
India and the General Election (1900).
"Melancholy Meanness."
The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.
No National Contribution?
The "Slimness" of the India Office.
"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:
Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage.
Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

In India, applications should be addressed to
Mr. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

is what its name implies

FEVER DESTROYER,

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER I know.
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage.
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., Rs. 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., & 1 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY,
43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C., AND
27 SECOND LINE BEACH, MADRAS.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England:—
June 1 to End of Year (Post free), 5s. 9d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.